

## REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of an Office Action dated August 9, 2006 as well as an Advisory Action dated February 9, 2007. This Supplemental Amendment and Reply is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination and supplements Applicants' response filed on January 9, 2007, entry and full consideration of which has been requested in the Request for Continued Examination.

In this response, Applicants have amended claim 15 to correct a typographical error and have added claim 33. Support for these amendments may be found in the application, *inter alia*, in figs. 3 and 4, at page 15, lines 2-7 and at lines 14-17. Following entry of these amendments, claims 1-19, 24-26, and 29-33 are pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks which follow.

### Objections to Claims and Specification

Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the PTO's indication, in paragraph 5 of the Advisory Action, that the outstanding claim objections and objections to the specification would be withdrawn based upon Applicants' response dated January 9, 2007, entry and full consideration of which has been requested in the Request for Continued Examination being filed concurrently herewith.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 2 of the Office Action dated August 9, 2006, the PTO rejected claims 1-26 and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,420,037 to Tsuji *et al.* (hereinafter "Tsuji") in view of U.S. Patent 6,283,507 to Kami *et al.* (hereinafter "Kami"). Applicants respectfully request full consideration of the remarks set forth in Applicants' response dated January 9, 2007 and the following supplemental remarks.

In the Advisory Action dated February 9, 2007, the PTO has directed Applicants' attention to Example 4 of Tsuji, particularly the discussion at the top of column 7.

In response, Applicants note that independent claims 1, 18, and 19 each comprise "a first silicone placed on the opposed sides of the first and second portions, the first silicone

comprises a thermosetting silicone; and a second silicone interposed between the opposed sides of the first and second portions at a junction thereof, the second silicone comprising a solventless addition room-temperature-vulcanizing adhesive silicone.”

In Tsuji’s Example 4, the dimethylpolysiloxane is used as the coating, as pointed out by the Examiner. However, in contrast, in the airbags according to the presently claimed invention, it is the thermosetting silicone (“the first silicone”) that is applied to the fabric as the coating.

Moreover, in the airbags according to the presently claimed invention, it is the solventless, room-temperature-vulcanizing adhesive silicone (“the second silicone”) that is used as the adhesive silicone (the second silicone). In this regard, Applicants wish to direct the PTO’s attention to claim 12 which is directed to a “second silicone” which comprises “vinyl dimethylpolysiloxane.”

Accordingly, the cited references, taken individually or in combination, still fail to teach or suggest ““a first silicone placed on the opposed sides of the first and second portions, the first silicone comprises a thermosetting silicone; and a second silicone interposed between the opposed sides of the first and second portions at a junction thereof, the second silicone comprising a solventless addition room-temperature-vulcanizing adhesive silicone.” For this reason, Applicants submit that the outstanding rejection of independent claims 1, 18, and 19, as well as of the claims depending from these independent claims, is improper and ought to be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, taken together with the remarks set forth in Applicants’ response dated January 9, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under §103.

#### **Newly Added Claim**

In this response, Applicants have added claim 33. Applicants submit that claim 33 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends, and because the cited references fail to teach or suggest an airbag wherein “wherein the first and second portions are coated with the first silicone; and the second silicone adheres to the first silicone at the junction, and joins the first and second portions.”

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 9, 2007

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5540  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Richard L. Schwaab  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 25,479

Paul D. Strain  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 47,369